

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-1603

CLARENCE EVERETT JONES, SR., individually and
on behalf of all present and future inmates in
the Dorchester County Jails in Summerville,
South Carolina and in St. George, South
Carolina,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JOHN R. BARNES, Jail Administrator; A. PASTOR,
Captain, Detention Center Commander; S. GREEN,
First Lieutenant and Detention Supervisor; J.
WASHINGTON, First Lieutenant and
Administrative Officer; L. CARMICHAEL,
Lieutenant; C. HEYWARD, Lieutenant; S.
EVERETT, Lieutenant; L. HAYNES, Lieutenant and
Jail Team Commander; DORCHESTER COUNTY; RANDY
SCOTT, Chairman; SKIP ELLIOT; CHRIS MURPHY;
LARRY HARGETT; RICHARD ROSEBROCK, Dorchester
County Council Member; RAY NASH, Dorchester
County Sheriff; TARA RICHARDSON, City
Magistrate of Dorchester County in her
official capacity, Chairman,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

KERRY MITCHELL CARN, individually,

Defendant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Margaret B. Seymour, District Judge. (CA-04-2527-2-MBS)

Submitted: August 29, 2005

Decided: September 16, 2005

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Clarence Everett Jones, Sr., Appellant Pro Se. James Albert Stuckey, Jr., Charleston, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Clarence Everett Jones, Sr., seeks to appeal the district court's order denying an extension of the discovery period and dismissing one defendant in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) action. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2000), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2000); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541 (1949). The order Jones seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED